

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

Due to the length of the specification herein, Applicants will cite to the paragraph number of the published patent application (PG Pub) of the present application, i.e., US 2005/0260405, when discussing the application description, both in this section and in the Remarks section, *infra*, rather than to page and line of the specification as filed.

Claim 1 has been amended by limiting the coating system (F), as supported in the specification at paragraphs [0100]-[0101]; by limiting the elastic intercoat (D) to one comprising a thermoplastic elastomer, as supported in the specification at paragraph [0047]; by limiting the substrate Markush group and by adding that physical mixtures thereof are included, as supported in the specification at paragraph [0025]; and by inserting that each coat is coextensive with the substrate, as at least implicitly supported in the specification by the disclosure of coextrusion as one method of making the claimed multicoat system, at paragraph [0209], and by the disclosure of, for example, the use of the claimed multicoat system as or in an automotive clear coat, at paragraph [0231], which would necessarily have all coats coextensive with a substrate.

Claim 7 has been amended by deleting members from the elastic intercoat (D) Markush group. Claim 24 has been amended by deleting superfluous matter.

New Claim 29 has been added, and is supported by Claim 7.

Claims 6, 22 and 28 have been canceled.

No new matter is believed to have been added by the above amendment. Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 16, 19-21, 23-27 and 29 are now pending in the application. All claims are active except Claim 25, which stands withdrawn from consideration.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the telephone discussion held August 3, 2010, in the above-identified application. During the discussion, Applicants' attorney explored with the Examiner possible amendments which in the Examiner's opinion would render the claims patentable over the applied prior art. The discussion is summarized and expanded upon below.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-9, 19-24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US 6,500,883 (Mack et al) in view of US 6,482,489 (Otaki et al), US 4,824,905 (Saeki et al), and US 3,880,953 (Downey) or US 4,136,071 (Korpman), is respectfully traversed.

As previously noted, Mack et al is drawn to improving the impact resistance of filled polyamides by adding a component having adhesion-promoting properties (column 3, line 43ff). Otaki et al is drawn to hologram laminates wherein pressure-sensitive adhesives are used. Downey and Korpman are relied on for a disclosure of thermoplastic elastomers as pressure sensitive adhesives.

Saeki et al discloses that polyamide resins suffer from decrease of impact strength in a dry state, and dimensional change and/or decrease of tensile strength due to moisture absorption (column 1, lines 26-29) and that it has been suggested to melt mix a polyamide with an ABS resin, but this is problematic because the compatibility between the polyamide and the ABS resin is inherently bad (column 1, lines 43-49). Saeki et al addresses this problem by combining the polyamide and a graft copolymer which may be ABS with a carboxylic-modified copolymer, as disclosed (column 2, lines 1-25).

The Examiner holds, in effect, that the present invention would have been obvious based on the combination of the above-applied references.

In reply, even if the above references were combined, the result would still not be the presently-claimed invention. None of the applied prior art discloses or suggests any of the

presently-recited substrates. Moreover, contrary to the finding by the Examiner, Otaki et al's hologram laminates do not read on the presently-recited claimed multicoat system for at least the reason that the layers of Otaki et al are not all coextensive with the substrate thereof.

For all the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 16, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mack et al in view of Otaki et al, [Saeki et al ?], US 5,403,658 (Southwick et al), and Downey or Korpman, is respectfully traversed.

Southwick et al discloses an adhesive composition which comprises a tackifying resin, a styrene-isoprene-styrene (SIS) block copolymer of the type commonly used in adhesives and a block copolymer of a conjugated diolefin which contains both a vinyl aromatic hydrocarbon and an acrylic monomer as part of the polymer backbone (column 1, lines 58-64). Southwick et al discloses further that it is essential to the performance of their invention that the block copolymers used therein have sufficient acrylic monomer to provide sufficient polar-type functionality to provide enhanced adhesion to polar surfaces, aluminum, glass, Kraft paper, etc., relative to block polymers of conjugated dienes and/or vinylaromatic hydrocarbons which do not contain such acrylic monomers in the polymer backbone (column 5, lines 61-68).

The Examiner holds that it would have been obvious to add an acrylate copolymer as disclosed by Southwick et al to the adhesive layer of Mack et al "in order to improve adhesion to polar substrates."

In reply, Southwick et al does not remedy the deficiencies in the combination of the other-applied references. Moreover, it is not seen how Southwick et al discloses or suggests the addition of a layer analogous to presently-recited second substrate layer (C) in the article resulting from the combination of the other-applied prior art.

For all the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-9, 19-24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US 6,103,370 (Onozawa et al) in view of JP 05-18671 (Matsuoka et al), US 4,299,929 (Sakano et al), and Downey or Korpman, is respectfully traversed.

As previously noted, Onozawa et al is drawn to a hard coat sheet comprising a base sheet and a coat layer, which is disclosed as adherable to, for example, a window pane by providing an adhesive layer on the back of the base sheet. Matsuoka et al is relied on for a disclosure of a windshield plate made of a polycarbonate resin. Downey and Korpman have been discussed above.

Sakano et al discloses that blend mixtures of ABS type resins and polycarbonate resins are known for their excellent mechanical properties and molding-processability, but they are insufficient in dwelling thermal stability (column 1, lines 9-20). Sakano et al's invention is drawn to improving the dwelling thermal stability by incorporation of an acid or its anhydride therein (column 1, lines 28-32).

The Examiner's rationale is that it would have been obvious to employ the polycarbonate of Matsuoka et al, modified with ABS, as disclosed by Sakano et al, as the window pane material of Onozawa et al, and to employ the pressure sensitive adhesives of Downey or Korpman to adhere the base sheet of Onozawa et al to a polycarbonate-ABS window pane, as suggested by Sakano et al.

In reply, even if the above references were combined, the result would still not be the presently-claimed invention. None of the applied prior art discloses or suggests any of the presently-recited substrate materials. In addition, while Sakano et al may disclose that polycarbonate-ABS combinations have been used, there is no disclosure that such combinations have been used for window panes and thus, there is no motivation in the art to combine them to make a window pane.

For all the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 16, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Onozawa et al in view of Matsuoka et al, [Sakano et al ?], Southwick, and Downey or Korpman, is respectfully traversed.

All the above prior art has been discussed above. Southwick et al does not remedy the deficiencies in the combination of the other-applied references. Moreover, it is not seen how Southwick et al discloses or suggests the addition of a layer analogous to presently-recited second substrate layer (C) in the article resulting from the combination of the other-applied prior art.

For all the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently-pending claims in this application are now in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Harris A. Pitlick  
Registration No. 38,779

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)